

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 26, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,455,851 (Lord et al.). Claims 2-4 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lord et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,262 (Taki et al.). Claims 5-7, 10, 13-16 and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lord et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,919,823 (Lock). Claims 8, 9, 18, 19 and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Lord et al. and Taki et al. in view of Lock. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

With regard to independent claim 1, applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as stated. In particular, the Office Action is understood to assert that one skilled art would modify Lord et al. so that the video camera of Lord et al. would be provided with a light source to capture images such as license plate images, in the dark. With respect to this claim, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action is using the applicant's disclosure against the claims. In particular, Lord et al. is noticeably silent with respect to the provision of any illumination source being associated with Lord's image camera. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner identify support for the assertion in the Office Action, and particularly to identify a suggestion in the prior art itself to modify the camera of Lord in such a fashion.

Turning to the remaining independent claims, 12 and 20, without considering the propriety of the rejection for the reasons given above, these claims are being amended herein to

recite additional details of the storing of the collected video image. In particular, these claims now recite that a feature of interest in the digital image is stored in an uncompressed format, whereas the remainder of the image is stored in a compressed format. These features find support at least in paragraph [0026] of the present specification.


Claims 18 and 21, which depend from claims 12 and 20 respectively, and relate to the provision of a second video camera, has also been amended to recite that the image storage associated with the second camera image is also preformed in this fashion.

Lord et al., has been reviewed, but is not seen to teach or suggest at least these claimed features.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is believed in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If the examiner believes a teleconference would be beneficial in expediting the prosecution of application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 202-861-1696.

In the event this paper is not time filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 87354.2880.

Respectively submitted,
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Leo J. Jennings
Registration No. 32,902

Date: September 26, 2006
Baker & Hostetler LLP
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 861-1500